

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed December 7, 2005, the Examiner noted that claims 1-16 were pending, and rejected claims 1-16. Claims 1, 12, 13, 14, and 15 have been amended, and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-16 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections and objections are traversed below.

Page 2 of the Office Action rejects all claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Borgida and Corey.

Borgida discusses a knowledge base that queries a database through a translation system. Borgida integrates the knowledge bases management system with a database. The translation system translates a compositional type query into a database query. As noted by the Examiner Borgida does not teach or suggest obtaining information from another unit for merging.

Corey is directed to a system in which a user query is used to access several different search engines and the single result from the multiple engines with the highest correlation to the query is used as the response. There is no teaching that the information from the search engines is unfixed. There is no teaching that the unfixed information presented in response to the user's query originated from a human subject matter service provider specialist. There is no teaching or discussion of obtaining unfixed information based on specific condition of a mediating condition list. There is also no teaching of merging information much less fixed and unfixed information.

It is apparent that the Examiner is interpreting the claims and, it is submitted, misinterpreting the claims too broadly. For example, the Examiner compares the "meditating condition storing unit" of claim 1 to the database mentioned in Borgida claim 1. The database of Borgida stores entities to be located while, the storage unit of claim 1 stores "mediating conditions", two very different things. It is submitted that the Examiner is impermissibly ignoring parts of the claims when making an interpretation based comparison to the prior art. As another example, in making the overly broad interpretation and comparison, the Examiner compares the fixed contents of the mediation conditions storing unit and the variable or unfixed information of the other information storage unit with the two search engine systems that are discussed by Corey. As the currently amended claims illustrate, the variable or unfixed information of the other information storage unit originate from a **human** subject matter service provider specialist. Stated another way, the other information storage unit is populated with variable or unfixed

information by a human subject matter specialist. Corey, in contrast, discloses two search engines that have been populated by an undisclosed method. The specification, however, strongly suggests a mechanically method of populating the search engines. (See Corey, column 1, lines 16-19) Furthermore, Corey provides no information as to the fixed or unfixed nature of the results of the search engines. Thus, Corey does not teach the disclosed feature of a human subject matter. For these reasons, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

The present invention, in some embodiments, is directed to providing an information service to a user, such as help in establishing an office. To facilitate this service a list of services is stored, listing services such as establishing a new office. Information about each service is also stored. This information can be fixed/non-variable and variable. Fixed information is information such as the numbers of chairs and desks for the number of people in an office. The variable information can be information, such as the size of office space available and the cost per square foot of the office space. The variable information is available from sources of specific information. For example, the real estate information is available from a real estate source at a corresponding location and the cost of furniture is available from a furniture source at a corresponding location. The variable information is updated as it changes by a human subject matter specialist for the specific service, not by an automated process. Thus, accuracy and quality of the information presented to the user is ensured. The user of the service inputs a request for the service that includes service constraints or conditions. The conditions or constraints include information, such as the number of employees. The condition information is used to determine additional information conditions needed for obtaining the variable information. For example, the number of people in the new office is used to determine information about a suitable office size. For example a small office may not need as much space for each person as a large office because a large office needs more space for support services, such as a receptionist. The determined additional information, as another example may be used to produce a list of typical furniture items for the number of people. A small office may not need receptionist furniture where a large office would. The determined (suitable office size) information is then used to obtain the variable information, such as, concerning what office space is available and the cost of such space. That is, the fixed and additional information along with the identified service is used to obtain the variable information from an identified variable information source. The fixed information, the variable information, the constraints, and the additional information conditions is used to determine computed information, such as the cost of establishing the small office. The information is then combined and supplied to the user responsive to the request.

This capability is variously emphasized in several of the currently amended claims and, as claimed, is not provided or suggested by the prior art of Borgida and/or Corey. For this additional reason, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

It is submitted that the invention of the claims 1-16 distinguishes over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _____

By: _____
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501